

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

7290.9
C 76

3 MINUTES, OF USDA CONFERENCE ON RUNOFF AND WATERFLOW RETARDATION
September 11 and 12, 1951 - Tulsa, Oklahoma
John A. Short, Chairman

Those in attendance included:

John A. Short	USDA	Tulsa, Oklahoma
T. J. Cunningham	PMA	Tulsa, Oklahoma
Paul Leaming	PMA	Washington, D. C.
R. A. Hertzler	USDA	Washington, D. C.
K. M. Sandals	SCS	Lincoln, Nebraska
Howard Matson	SCS	Ft. Worth, Texas
Paul Swarthout	FS	Tulsa, Oklahoma
Henry Lobenstein	FS	Ogden, Utah
Ray McDaniel	SCS	Albuquerque, New Mexico
Wm. Shamon	SCS	Ft. Worth, Texas
H. C. Dean	SCS	Tulsa, Oklahoma
P. Ghormley	SCS	Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Max Tharp	BAE	Tulsa, Oklahoma
George Stevenson	FS	New Orleans, Louisiana
H. G. Meginnis	FS	New Orleans, Louisiana
James Black	REA	Tulsa, Oklahoma
Alvin Ayers	ARA	Tulsa, Oklahoma
L. L. Kelly	SCS	Tulsa, Oklahoma

The discussion followed the prepared agenda as follows:

1. Status of AWR activities and purpose of meeting - John A. Short, USDA Field Representative.

Mr. Short reviewed briefly the procedures followed in the AWR studies and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the present status of work in the studies of runoff and waterflow retardation and discuss special problems confronting those responsible for the studies.

2. Summary of recent developments in USDA policy and procedures in runoff and waterflow retardation - R. A. Hertzler, USDA Flood Control Survey Officer.

Mr. Hertzler discussed recent developments in regard to authorizations, appropriations, and supplemental reports, as these developments in the Missouri Basin might relate to investigations in the AWR Basins. He stated also that the report of the President's Water Policy Commission was under review by a "Review Commission" set up in the Bureau of the Budget, and that it was the purpose of the "Review Commission" to recommend to the President appropriate action on policy and implementation of the policy.

It was suggested that procedures in the AWR Basins (for agriculture) might be different than in the Missouri Basin, inasmuch as specific authority for the investigations is available in the AWR Basins.

The presentation of the report, in regard to breakdown of the area, was discussed at this time also. It was the general opinion that the three basin, eight state breakdown would be followed for the water-flow retardation recommendations, and that breakdowns into the ten areas under investigation might be wise. This finer breakdown would, of course, be influenced by the desires of the Corps of Engineers and others, but it was thought desirable to have as few breakdowns as possible. There will be more definite information on this at a later date.

3. Recent viewpoints and developments within SCS as related to runoff and waterflow retardation - Carl Brown, Chief, Water Conservation Division, SCS.

Mr. Brown confined his remarks to a few short statements regarding developments in the Missouri Basin.

4. Recent viewpoints and developments within the Forest Service as related to runoff and waterflow retardation - H. G. Meginnis, Chief, Flood Control Surveys, Southern Forest Experiment Station.

Mr. Meginnis indicated that all the points he had in mind had been covered by others previously.

5. Current thinking on monetary evaluation of projects and programs in AWR Basin studies - Max Tharp, BAE Field Representative.

Mr. Tharp stated that the agencies concerned have agreed tentatively to the principles outlined in the "Green Book" (with the exception of recommendations on price levels, primary and secondary benefits, fish and wildlife, and recreation benefits) and that the AWRBIAC will soon consider adoption of the "Green Book" recommendations with the exceptions noted. In regard to converting costs and prices of previously completed surveys to the agreed upon 1949 prices, it was decided that this would not be done at this time unless necessary for coordination purposes.

6. Status of survey investigations in the AWR Basins - H. C. Dean and Regional representatives.

The status of the surveys is as follows:

Washita - Review report is receiving field review in accordance with FIARBC procedures. (Step 4 of Hutchinson's letter of July 7, 1950)

Grand (Neosho) - In Bureau of Budget for its report as to conformity with the program of the President. (Step 13 of Hutchinson's letter of July 7, 1950)

Upper White - About ready to be sent to the Secretary's Office.
(Step 8 of Hutchinson's letter of July 7, 1950)

Lower Arkansas - About ready to be sent to the Secretary's Office.
(Step 8 of Hutchinson's letter of July 7, 1950)

Fountain - Sent to Secretary's Office in June 1951. (Step 10 of Hutchinson's letter of July 7, 1950)

Lower White - Preliminary work leading up to program formulation has been completed. Some field work on independent measures remains to be done.

Ouachita - Damages have been evaluated, and tentative program developed. Some work on independent measures remains.

Upper Arkansas - Field work substantially completed except for about one month's work in Region 5. It will be sometime after January 1 before a summary of findings and recommendations is available; however, this will not include coordination work with the Army.

Arkansas above Pueblo - Field work is done; technicians are ready to start work on program formulation; it will be sometime after January 1 before a tentative summary of findings and recommendations is available, and this will not include coordination of work with the Army.

Red - Field work is completed. A summary of findings and recommendations should be available about January 1, but this will not include coordination with the Army.

7. Special problems.

- a. Relationship and coordination of USDA with Corps of Engineers and other projects.

Howard Matson reported on progress in coordination in the Washita with the Corps and Bureau. Probable areas of disagreement and problems in coordination were discussed, including various ways of allocating benefits. It was agreed that hydrologic re-evaluation of the land treatment programs would not be necessary, unless, under AWR studies, radical changes in land use were recommended.

- b. Manner in which other Agricultural agencies may participate in development of runoff and waterflow retardation data and review findings and recommendations in areas not yet completed.

It was decided that the survey parties would work with state teams to the extent that it was possible, considering time and funds available; this can be carried out through meetings and submission of material to the state agricultural teams in summary form; the findings and recommendations will then be sent to the USDA Field Committee, who will be responsible for ironing out

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ARTS

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1/2
discrepancies and arranging for review by Agricultural agencies and interested states in cases where such review has not been possible previously. In connection with the "basic agricultural data team," it was decided that basic data could be reviewed by this team or by the "waterflow retardation team," depending upon the situation.

- c. Manner in which runoff and waterflow retardation data will be presented in report.

The Tulsa Group is now working on a general format and outline for Parts I and II of the report. The Work Group on Flood Control and Waterflow Retardation will write the detailed outline for its portion of Part II. The assembly and summarization of the waterflow retardation findings and recommendations will be guided by this outline.

- d. Discussion of specific, independent measures, including prices, to be included in report, with reference to obtaining as much uniformity as possible.

Field representatives agreed that this was being accomplished, or would be accomplished, in those areas not yet completed.

- e. Discussion of how sediment control will be incorporated in the AWR report.

At this time sediment control is part of the "Agricultural Work Group" responsibility. However, important parts of the sediment control work are carried out in relation to the waterflow retardation surveys, and will continue to be carried out in these surveys.

- f. Relation of land treatment measures, including costs, recommended in survey reports to those being developed by "Conservation and Improvement of Farm and Range Lands" and "Forestry" Teams.

This was discussed in general terms. (The USDA Field Committee will attempt to clarify this problem at a later date.)

- 8. Plans for proceeding with the runoff and waterflow activities in fiscal years 1952, 1953, and 1954, including discussion of funds.

It was concluded that the apparent large amount of work required for coordination of the waterflow retardation work with other activities would require that additional flood control funds be requested for the SCS in 1953. (Forest Service funds requests appeared satisfactory.)

